UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/078,419	02/21/2002	Amrish K. Lal	SVL920010085US1 0920.0017	6092

			EXAMINER
23373	7590	02/16/2006	BHATIA, AJAY M

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Office Action Summary	**Application No.**	**Applicant(s)**
		10/078,419	LAL, AMRISH K.
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	
		Ajay M. Bhatia	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 December 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/07/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Additionally added a new claim. Claim 30 which depends from claim 4.

Applicant repeatedly addresses previous rejection that was based upon a different rejection therefore arguments addressing the previous response are moot. Additionally examiner did state prior arguments failed to overcome the combination of the prior art.

Additionally applicant has not provided any arguments of how the application for invention overcomes the prior art. Other then the newly added claim is not taught, examiner has addressed the claim bellow. Therefore the rejection is maintained.

In response to claim 30, applicant fails to claim where the changing of the document occurs, when a web browser views a web page a local copy is down loaded to the client. Therefore the features of claim 30 are taught by the combination of Glass-Laiho. Therefore the presented arguments are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Glass et al. (U.S. Patent 6,253,204 referred to as Glass) in view of Laiho et al.

(PCT/FI00/00074 or WO 00/46696).

2.   For claim 1, Glass teaches, a system for correcting links to resources in a

network, comprising:

        a link checking service unit associated with a first group of resources and

configured for determining if a location of a resource among the first group of resources

has changed; and

        a link correction service unit configured for sending a request to the link checking

service to determine validity of a link, receiving a response indicating a status of the link,

and modifying a document containing (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5

lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

Glass fails to clearly discloses, link based on the received response

Laiho teaches, link based on the received response (see Laiho page 7)

        It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine Glass's method of finding broken links and Laiho

process of finding the location of incorrect links and correcting them. Glass provides for

a method of healing links and Laiho provides for a method of automatically correcting

invalid links and providing a "correction message." (see Glass, Col.1 lines 52-55, Col. 4 lines 56-59, Col. 5 lines 15-20, Col. 5 lines 26-35) and (see Laiho pages 3, 8, 7)

3.   For claim 2, Glass-Laiho teaches, the system of claim 1, wherein said document is a World-Wide Web page, and said link is a hypertext link. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

4.   For claim 3, Glass-Laiho teaches, the system of claim 1, wherein the link checking service unit sends a response message containing a current location of said resource if the location of said resource has changed, and the link correction service, in response to receiving the response message changing a document containing the link to indicate the current location of the resource. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

5.   For claim 4, Glass-Laiho teaches, a method of correcting a link in a document, comprising:

        sending a request to a link checking service unit to check a status of a resource corresponding to the link;

        receiving a response to said request, the response containing an indication of a changed location of the resource; and

changing the document based on the indication of the changed location of the
resource. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-
43)

6.   For claim 5, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 4, wherein the response
further includes a link status code indicating a status of the resource. (see Glass, Col. 4
line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

7.   For claim 6, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 4, wherein the document
is a World-Wide Web page and the link is a hypertext link. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to
Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

8.   For claim 7, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 4, wherein the link
includes a first uniform resource locator (URL) and the indication of the changed
location of the resource includes a second URL, wherein the document is changing by
changing the first URL in the link to the second URL. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5
line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

9.   For claim 8, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 4, wherein the document
is changed by automatically deleting the link in the document if the response does not
include a replacement link and contains a link status code indicating that the link is

invalid.

(see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

10.   For claim 9, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 4, wherein said sending a

request, receiving a response, and changing the document are performed in a web

server. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

11.   For claim 10, Glass-Laiho teaches, an apparatus for correcting a link in a

document, comprising:

       a document repository having stored therein one or more documents;

       a corrected document repository having stored therein one or more corrected

documents;

       a link correction service unit connected to the document repository and the

corrected document repository, and configured to parse a link from one of the

documents in the document repository, generate a request for checking the validity of

the link, correct the link in response to receipt of a response message containing a

corrected link, and store a corrected document having the corrected link in the corrected

document repository. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col.

6 lines12-43)

12.   For claim 11, Glass-Laiho teaches, the apparatus of claim 10, wherein the apparatus is part of a web server. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

13.   For claim 12, Glass-Laiho teaches, the apparatus of claim 10, wherein the link is a hypertext link containing a uniform resource locator (URL) and the document is a web page. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

14.   For claim 13, Glass-Laiho teaches, an apparatus for correcting a link in a document, comprising:

        means for sending a request to a link checking service unit to check a status of a resource corresponding to the link;

        means for receiving a response to said request, the response containing an indication of a changed location of the resource; and

        means for changing the document based on the indication of the changed location of the resource. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

15.   For claim 14, Glass-Laiho teaches, a computer readable medium of instructions suitable for execution by a computer, comprising:

        program instructions for sending a request to a link checking service to check a status of a resource corresponding to the link;

program instructions for receiving a response to said request, the response

containing an indication of a changed location of the resource; and

program instructions for changing the document based on the indication of the

changed location of the resource. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines

20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

16.   For claim 15, Glass-Laiho teaches, a method for determining a status of a link in

a document, comprising:

receiving a request to determine the status of the link in the document, wherein

the link includes a location indicator of a resource;

detecting if the resource is present within a storage unit at a location indicated by

the location indicator;

determining if the resource is present at an alternate location if the resource is

not detected in the location indicated by the location indicator; and

returning an alternate location identifier indicating the alternate location of the

resource if the resource is determined to be present at the alternate location. (see

Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43) and (see

Laiho, page 7 and 8) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1,

applies equally as well to claim 15.

17.   For claim 16, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein the link is a

hypertext link and the location indicator of the resource is a uniform resource locator

(URL). (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

18.   For claim 17, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 16, wherein the resource

is a web page. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6

lines12-43)

19.   For claim 18, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 16, further comprising

returning a link status code indicating whether the resource is present in the storage

unit. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

20.   For claim 19, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 18, wherein the link

status code indicates whether the resource has been deleted from the storage unit. (see

Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-43)

21.   For claim 20, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 15, wherein said

determining if the resource is present at an alternate location is performed by consulting

a mapping table associating a first location indicator with a second location indicator,

wherein the first location indicator indicates a prior location of the resource and the

second location indicator indicates a present location of the resource. (see Laiho, page

4 and 7-9)The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies

equally as well to claim 15.

22.   For claim 21, Glass-Laiho teaches, the method of claim 20, wherein the first and

second location indicators are uniform resource locators (URLs). (see Laiho, page 4

and 7-9)The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally

as well to claim 15.

23.   For claim 22, Glass-Laiho teaches, an apparatus for correcting a link in a

document, comprising:

a document repository having stored therein one or more documents;

a mapping table unit having stored therein mapping table information associating a first

prior resource-locator with a first present resource-locator, the first prior resource-

locator indicating a prior location of a first resource within the document repository and

the first present resource-locator indicating a present location of the first resource; and

a link checking service unit connected to the document repository and the mapping

table unit, and configured to locate an entry in the mapping table information based on a

requested resource-locator contained in a request for information concerning location of

the first resource, to identify the first present resource-locator stored in association with

the first prior resource-locator, and to send a response message containing the first

present resource-locator. (see Laiho, page 4 and 7-9)The same motivation that was

utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15.

24.   For claim 23, Glass-Laiho teaches, the apparatus of claim 22, wherein the first

prior and first present resource-locators are uniform resource locators (URLs). (see

Laiho, page 4 and 7-9)The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15.

25. For claim 24, Glass-Laiho teaches, the apparatus of claim 22, wherein the mapping table further includes a second prior resource-locator indicating a location of a second resource and a status code indicating a status of the second prior resource-locator. (see Laiho, page 4 and 7-9)The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15.

26. For claim 25, Glass-Laiho teaches, the apparatus of claim 24, wherein the status code indicates that the second resource corresponding to the second prior resource-locator has been deleted. (see Laiho, page 7 and 9) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15.

27. For claim 26, Glass-Laiho teaches, the apparatus of claim 24, wherein the status code indicates that the second prior resource-locator indicates a present location of the second resource in the document repository. (see Laiho, page 7 and 9) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15.

28.   For claim 27, Glass-Laiho teaches, the apparatus of claim 22, wherein the

apparatus is part of a web server. (see Laiho, page 4 and 7-9)The same motivation that

was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15.

29.   For claim 28, Glass-Laiho teaches, an apparatus for determining a status of a

link in a document, comprising:

        means for storing one or more resources;

        means for receiving a request to determine the status of the link in the document,

wherein the link includes a location indicator of a resource;

        means for detecting if the resource is present within said means for storing at a

location indicated by the location indicator;

        means for determining if the resource is present at an alternate location if the

resource is not detected in the location indicated by the location indicator; and

        means for returning an alternate location identifier indicating the alternate

location of the resource if the resource is determined to be present at the alternate

location. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6 lines12-

43)

30.   For claim 29, Glass-Laiho teaches, a computer readable medium of instructions

suitable for execution on a computer for determining a status of a link in a document,

comprising:

program instructions for receiving a request to determine the status of the link in

the document, wherein the link includes a location indicator of a resource;

program instructions for detecting if the resource is present within a storage unit

at a location indicated by the location indicator;

program instructions for determining if the resource is present at an alternate

location if the resource is not detected in the location indicated by the location indicator;

and

program instructions for returning an alternate location identifier indicating the

alternate location of the resource if the resource is determined to be present at the

alternate location. (see Glass, Col. 4 line 56 to Col. 5 line 20, Col. 5 lines 20-62, Col. 6

lines12-43)

31.   For claim 30, Glass-Laiho teaches, the system of claim 4, wherein the changing

of the document is performed automatically. (see Glass, Col. 1 lines 30-55)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. See attached UPSTO 892 (if appropriate).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ajay M. Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-

3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)272-3933. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JASON CARDONE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER